

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' attorney during the interview held November 2, 2005, in the above-identified application. During the interview, Applicants' attorney explained the presently-claimed invention and why it is patentable over the applied prior art, and discussed other issues raised in the Office Action. The discussion is summarized and expanded upon below.

The rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. 6,123,987 (Lescaut), is respectfully traversed. Lescaut discloses pulverulent coating compositions formulated from a polyamide and minor amounts of at least one phenolic polycondensate and/or at least one polyalkyl (meth)acrylate (column 1, lines 55-62). However, as conceded by the Examiner at the above-referenced interview, Lescaut neither discloses nor suggests the presently-recited PMMI. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 17-23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. 4,415,706 (Staas), is respectfully traversed. Staas discloses compatible blends of an imidized acrylic polymer containing at least 5% by weight glutarimide units, and a polyamide (Abstract). However, as conceded by the Examiner at the above-referenced interview, Staas neither discloses nor suggests the presently-recited PMMI. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 16-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. 6,123,948 (Dickens et al) in view of Staas, is respectfully traversed. Dickens et al is drawn to laser-sinterable powders and moldings obtained therefrom. The import of Dickens et al is that not all powders are available for sintering, and that some polymers, but not others, are sinterable to form molded products. Thus, while semi-crystalline powders such as nylon, polybutylene terephthalate (PBT) and polyacetal (PA) are disclosed as useful in their

invention (column 7, lines 28-35), amorphous polymers such as polycarbonate (PC) and acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene resins (ABS) produce disappointing results (column 8, lines 24-27). While, as discussed above, Staas discloses blends of a polyamide and an imidized acrylic polymer for various products, Staas does not disclose or suggest anything with regard to laser sintering. Therefore, there is no way of knowing whether the imidized acrylic polymer thereof would be capable of being laser sintered when combined with the polyamide. The Examiner appears to agree, in view of her agreement to withdraw the rejection.

For all the above reasons, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully call the Examiner's attention to the fact that the Office Action, which attached the Form PTO 1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed June 29, 2005, omitted the Examiner's initials for the document identified as "AW". **Enclosed** is another copy of the original Form. The Examiner is respectfully requested to initial the Form next to "AW", and include a copy thereof with the next Office communication.

All of the presently-pending claims in this application are believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon



Harris A. Pitlick

Registration No. 38,779

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 08/03)

NFO/HAP/cja